DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 548 SP 017 186

AUTHOR Richards, Les
TITLE Cooperative Relationships in Preservice and Inservice: A Report Prepared for Division H, AERA.
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation: *Cooperative Planning: Educational Cooperation: Inservice Teacher Education: Organizational Communication: Postsecondary Education: Preservice Teacher Education: Program Development: *Public Relations: *School Districts: *Schools of Education: Teacher Education Programs: *Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

Communication and openness seem to have a major impact on relationships. The scope of communication activity undertaken by many university schools of education includes workshops and institutes, periodic meetings, print and other media, demonstrations, and formal and informal training. In all activities, these schools have a responsibility to the school systems that they serve. Some, however, do not accept that responsibility very well. Through policies of academic advancement and consequent concentration on professional development, schools of education often promote faculty withdrawal from field-based operations and concentration on production areas where rewards are more fruitful. Preservice and inservice teacher education programs need to reevaluate their services and communication lines to the districts they serve. In preservice programs, school systems must feel part of what is happening at the university. Inservice programs must facilitate cooperation between the public school teachers and university faculty in designing programs that meet mutual needs. An effective and successful relationship between university schools of education and school districts can be achieved through an atmosphere of communication and openness. (CJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195548

DEC 2 Recd

Cooperative Relationships in Preservice and Inservice: A Report

Prepared for Division H, AERA

Dr. Les Richards

College of Education

University of Saskatchewan

Saskatoon, Canada

February 1980

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Richards

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 017 186

INTRODUCTION

> We should have a University that will leave no calling, no sphere of life untouched; a University that is as broad as these plains, as deep in richness as this marvellous soil, and as stimulating in spirit as the breezes which sweep over our fields.

These were the words of Walter C. Murray, a pioneer educator at the fledgling University of Saskatchewan in 1909. Walter Murray's dream has often been quoted with approval but, perhaps inevitably, has never been realized. It is a statement of the ideal and, while it is believed to be unattainable, it is a cause of regret that the ideal and reality have, over the years, seemed to have grown further and further apart.

There are many in the field of education for whom the drifting away of the North American University from those callings and spheres of life which it is supposed to serve, has given rise to profound concern. This concern resulted in the setting up of the Task Force for which this report was prepared. It was also a major reason for the bringing into being of the National Council of States on Inservice Education. It has also been a reason for the setting up of committees to examine current and potential external relations of various universities across the continent which would make recommendations for the improvement of these relations. Such a committee, was set up at the University of Saskatchewan in 1977. Its report, the Pinder Report, stated:

1. There has been and is a broad self-interest in the University's assuming a broad social role for higher education and learning. In latter times, the self-interest is more likely manifested in the justification provided for the very large sums of public funds spent by the University.

2. The External Relations Committee believes that it is vital to the welfare of the University that it continue to be held in high regard by the provincial community and that it be seen as a public resource accessible to all social and economic groups. While certain units of the University have a special responsibility for external or community relations, the general philosophy of openness and extension must be understood and projected by the entire institution. Like many other similar institutions founded in rural areas, this University may be living off goodwill accumulated from earlier times.

3. Much of what the University does in its external relations goes unnoticed by the public. It is not then surprising that some groups see the University as a remote institution; that what it is doing is irrelevant, at least to them. It is therefore essential that maintaining public confidence in the University's desire and ability to sustain a high level of community service, must be perceived as a continuing and important institutional goal.

The Pinder report went on to state what this writer regards as a most important and critical factor in external relations and that is that the larger and more complex a University becomes, the more the employment objective of most faculty members becomes one of professional careerism rather than public. service. Nowhere is this more evident than in an institution which tends to look inward during times of economic difficulty and takes up a "publish or perish" philosophy which, in turn, serves to enhance rather than diminish the goal of professional careerism mentioned above. While the above remarks refer to the University's relationship to the community in general, it would seem that school systems and their teachers do not always hold the University in general, and the College of Education in particular, in high regard nor do they see it as a public resource. It also seems that they regard the University as a remote institution and its doings as irrelevant. It appears to them that the University demands all as in requests for facilities to carry student teaching in its various aspects or in facilities for research opportunities, but, in turn, it gives nothing. There really does seem to be a need to examine more closely what the relationship between University and LEA's is and why, if the surmises mentioned above are true, closer relationships do not exist. The matter becomes of some importance when one realizes that many of the people who seem to hold these views are themselves graduates of the institution.

There are two major areas where relationships between University and LEA's may be improved. These are in the areas of preservice and inservice. The remainder of this paper will consist of an examination of general factors which affect these, followed by an indepth look at the specific areas and will conclude with some recommendations.

DELIMITING FACTORS

Communication

Communication and openness seem to have a major impact on relationships. When universities are small, communication between them and the general public is a relatively simple matter since it tends to be on a one-to-one basis. As the university becomes larger and the size of the bureaucracy required to run it becomes larger, then the increase in rules, red-tape and administrivia in general, implies a decrease in communication and openness. The College of Agriculture at the University of Saskatchewan has always been small in terms of numbers. It was the first part of the University to have meaningful and continuous relationships with agricultural practioners. These relationships continue to be as successful now as they were when the University was founded. Its faculty does not generally have that professional careerism referred to previously and it has made sure that its lines of communication with the field are always open.

The importance of communication was recently stressed by Dr. D. C. Williams, former president of the University of Western Ontario. He maintains that Canadian universities need a better image and that, while they may be involved in carrying out useful projects and research, they do not do a good job of informing the public. He believes that the universities have fallen from public favor, that we know it, don't like it (and often don't admit it), and therefore need to change public attitudes. "We are doing the commendable, positive things we should be doing, but we don't even tell each other, let alone the public whose support we need." Dr. Williams identified the problems as declining enrolment, underfunding, aging faculty and bored students and indicated that the president of a university should be the "front man" in terms of taking or selling the university to the public. "The presidents need to get into the control tower to help guide the real pilot" stressed Dr. Williams. "Here, surely, is a national role (useful research) for the universities, a role that demands our utmost in cooperation, internally and externally.

In the field of education, communication seems to be what Wolf refers to as fortuitous circumstance. Neither meaningless saturation nor limited inquiry, both of which are integral parts of educators' behavior, appear to have been totally successful in communicating the University, generally the College of Education, to school systems. The next five sub-headings indicate the scope of communication activity generally undertaken by Universities.

Workshops and Institutes

These activities are commonplace. They may be offered for periods of from one to four days, sometimes concentrating on a single topic, sometimes including a variety of topics. If a variety is included there may be individual presentations of as little as one hour in length devoted to, say, new methodology in social studies. The extent to which one can do justice to a topic such as that in one hour is debatable; the possibility that the recipients take away with them anything of lasting value is highly unlikely.

Workshops are usually sponsored by an institution or an organization external to school systems. The exception occurs when the system may be large enough and of a sufficient complexity that it is able to develop its own curricula and methodology and so sponsor its own workshops. Workshops are used to communicate the new curricula and its methodology. Sometimes the University will sponsor and conduct a workshop which will often, but not always, be connected with one of its ongoing programs. The College of Education, University of Saskatchewan sponsors workshops connected with its student teacher programs. The sponsorship and the conducting of the workshops is the joint responsibility of the Department of Education, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the College.

Institutes, as defined in the Canadian sense, are generally sponsored by the school system holding it. It will often draw presenters from outside itself, and a variety of presentations will take place.

It should be noted here that University — generally College of Education -- personnel may be asked to participate in both workshops and institutes. On the other hand they may not be asked to participate in either. Generally, they are asked because of what they as individuals can offer, not because they necessarily represent the College in what the College, per se has to offer.

The Periodic Meeting

Periodic Meetings are convened and planned by committees of designated people. They may be sponsored by local, provincial, national, or international bodies and they last from one to five days. They rely on invited speakers, selected presenters, panels and discussion groups. Programs are aimed at particular groups but anyone may attend. The nature of the group

usually suggests the emphasis of the program. Once again, if the University is not organizing the periodic meeting, there is no guarantee that it will participate in such a meeting. It is doubtful that any meaningful communication takes place between the University and School Systems as a result of periodic meetings.

Printed and Other Media

An inordinate amount of paper is the third component of the communication process. Every educational organization is caught up in the publication whirlpool, whether books, articles, monographs or simply a memorandum or bulletin for general distribution. There is, among management in education, a compulsive need to write so much so that the printed word as circulated among the rank and file, tends to lose any impact it might otherwise have had. The publishing industry aids and abets the urge to publish by offering educators all there is to know about anything. Publishing is a must says the University -- whether anyone reads the "stuff" doesn't matter but publish you must. There also seems to be a hierarchy of publications: a book written with someone is not worth as much as one you write yourself; a book written for "academic" consumption among a half dozen of one's colleagues in a University setting is held to be worth more than a text written for primary school children. Perhaps these are indicators of a double standard which tends to make the legend of the ivory tower have more meaning for people who work in school systems.

One further point should be made. An educator's position determines the quantity of published material which comes to him. If he serves on a curriculum committee he is inundated with curricular materials which are occasionally pertinent to his work. He reads them, comments on them while most of them remain within the committee. Little is disseminated outside to school systems so that, to some extent, the faculty member serving on a curriculum committee is acting as a censor -- as indeed are all other members of that committee.

Other forms of media perform similar functions to those performed by print materials. There is perhaps more interest in watching the message than in reading it. The message tends to be given on a periodic basis since these other media are expensive. Hence the efficacy of their use may leave something to be desired.

Demonstration

Demonstration is yet another example of a form of potentially good communication. The campus laboratory school was once the setting for communicating to interested observers the educational process as seen by the by the University. For one thing live students were actually taught and University instructors had the opportunity to interact with live bodies in a classroom instead of merely lecturing as to how it should be done. The disappearance of laboratory schools has helped to foster the curious myth that any person with good to excellent academic qualifications can teach others. Opportunities still exist for faculty to enter schools and work with school staffs and students but these opportunities do not appear to be widely taken up.

Goals

While school systems and the University are organizations and, as such, share certain properties with all other organizations, they do have special properties which differentiate them from other types of organizations. For example Carlson referred to schools as domesticated organizations meaning that schools are protected and cared for by society, a situation which is also true for the University. There is no struggle for survival since existence is guaranteed. As a consequence the efficiency of educational institutions and systems has never been challenged until recently. Schools are hard put to demonstrate achievements or to develop any kind of assessment programs. Universities do have the opportunity to demonstrate achievement if they are fortunate enough to engage in some eye-catching research which the news media feels is worth reporting. As a consequence of failure to demonstrate achievement, school systems and some parts of the University have become defensive and have produced organizational shells to protect themselves.

Conflict arises between educational organizations and society and among educational institutions if and when the goals held by each group are not compatible. The University may see schools as not achieving a desired performance level for their students. It will therefore blame the schools for turning out students of inferior quality even though there are many other factors which affect student performance. Acrimony will result when blame is attached and the University will be seen as an enemy by those whom it has graduated.

A problem which contributes to goal conflict seems to arise from the fact that educational goals tend to be equivocal or vague. Measuring instruments are almost impossible to construct -- at least to the extent that they are acceptable to all parties. The Center for the Study of Evaluation in 1971 adopted 106 goals at a level of specificity between behavioral objectives and simple statement of vague intent. The Northern California Program Development Center in 1972 prepared 18 goals, based on research indicating that they were all-encompassing and acceptable. Field tests on them indicated that they were acceptable to society as legitimate aims of educational institutions. To avoid conflict it would seem that educational organizations must work out goals and norms which are acceptable to all those who have an interest in education.

Formal Training

The component which has the greatest effect on relationships are the various teacher training programs which, over most of North America, have become the universal prerogative of the Universities. Arguments still persist whether this is wise. Perhaps if teacher education had been a major criterion of programs instead of teacher training, school systems, relationships and the University would stand in higher regard with society than they do at present. The programs offered at the undergraduate level are almost entirely pre-service in nature and seem to be lacking in various areas. The extent to which the lack occurs seems to be a function of the experiences to which the student, as an undergraduate, was exposed. Programs -- even graduate programs -- seem to need a stronger in-service commitment both on the part of the University and of the LEA's. That this fact is recognized by school system management may be seen in a later section of this report.

In addition to these methods of communicating, there might be included one more, one that might be called informal communication. It may perhaps be the most important form of communication between the University and School Systems. It occurs regularly among educators and is rarely planned. It occurs, more often than not, in relation to one or more of the methods which have been mentioned previously. It has been identified as being important in change literature where it is seen as having merit as a secondary reinforcer or as a legitimator of decision-making.

In a paper presented to a Washington conference almost fifteen years ago, a period of time lapse for which the writer makes no apologies whatsoever, Egon Guba said that while decisions about innovations in education are made collectively within a bureaucratic social system, it is possible for one highly placed management person to block that change. He also added that educational innovations do not readily lend themselves to research, development and evaluation; and that, in general, economic incentives for innovation adoption do not obviously exist within education. Education does not apparently have an institutional change process in operation. These statements, if true, tend to prevent change taking place within a school system. Among various educational institutions they act as barriers to communication and openness.

It is now suggested that Ronald Havelock's formula should be considered as a means of improving communication among educational institutions. In 1969 he attempted to simplify the knowledge diffusion and utilization process by using the formula: who says what to whom by what channel to what effect for what purpose. While this formula may not be strictly accurate according to pure-research, statistically-oriented, theoretically-based pundits, it can work.

As applied to education who (a team of university educators and teachers) says what (a new social studies curriculum) to whom (the high school teachers in the province) by what channel (curriculum materials and workshops) to what effect (adoption in many high schools) for what purpose (improved social studies teaching leading to better student understanding).

If the formula were to be used to evaluate current methods of communication in education, it would appear that the level of their efficiency would not be very high.

The formula could be used to determine the place of people in the educational communication process. We could determine who initiates, sustains, adopts, and what norms influence adoption. It may also be used to obtain base-line data about the relationship between innovation complexity and innovation adoption.

PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE

Introduction

Before discussing the University's role in terms of its preservice and inservice relationships with LEA's, it might perhaps be pertinent to look at some general principles pertaining to external relations in general.

It goes without saying that an educational component should lie at the heart of the University's external relations. But this component should be readily distinguishable from that of other agencies since the University is possessed of educational resources which are unique to it. It would also appear that the University's role vis-a-vis this component should be given a very high priority in terms of faculty responsibilities and budgetary allotment. Further in this regard, academic advancement and promotion should involve attaching greater weight to the performance of extension work. Nowhere is this latter point more critical than in the College of Education. In all its activities the College has a responsibility to the school systems which it serves but it seems to accept that responsibility in a very cavalier fashion. Through its policies of academic advancement and the consequent concentration on professional careerism, it may encourage its faculty to withdraw from field-based operations and concentrate on those areas of production where rewards are more fruitful. Two field-based operations which are more or less continuing in nature are preservice programs which involve student teaching and inservice programs.

Preservice Programs.

The questions of the effectiveness of student teaching in its various ramifications, has been discussed ad nauseam. The question is not an issue here — it is accepted as being a vital and necessary part of preservice programs. What is at issue is what the University does with it. Far too often, it appears that the University, through its College of Education, seeks the aid of school jurisdictions but doesn't seem to want to give too much in return.

In February, 1979, the writer undertook a survey of superintendents who were regularly involved in placement of student teachers, and of a randomly selected

group of principals in the same school systems. The survey was intended to obtain some measure of opinion from persons who, as far as school system administrators are concerned, have a close connection with the University through its College of Education.

Many respondents commented that the relationship is based on their schools attempting to provide services requested by the College rather than their seeking help from the University or particular guidance and service from the College. One writer felt that "the present arrangement is satisfactory and that while it may be desirable to have a closer liaison it is probably not essential!"

Responses to the questions asked were quite varied. In general it was possible to distinguish some trends in the pattern of responses which are summarized in the pages which follow.

Are there continuous relationships other than with the College of Education?

There was a universal 'no' to this question. Some LEA's indicated that there were occasional relationships and quoted activities such as high school liaison, which is a fairly recent innovation, university visitation programs, and the academic talents program for students who are definitely university bound. Comments on these indicated that the last of these was the best organized perhaps for obvious reasons, the second was "largely a waste of time", the first was too impersonal.

The following comments serve to indicate a feeling among LEA's that matters could be improved.

"The existing lack of relationship is probably a result of very little interest on the part of the University in School Jurisdictions."

"What we have is sporadic and often times inadequate communication.

"To the residents here, the university is a distant and shadowy figure. There is no feeling of hostility only one of detachment."

How do you see current relationships?

It is agreed by respondents that on the whole current relationship are satisfactory as far as they go. There is a need to establish more constant and valid guidance to students entering a number of colleges at the university.

Some respondents indicate that on occasion relationships become strained due to a lack of communication. Some specific comments of interest are:

"The current relationship isn't particularly good. I believe the University could do more to promote itself by making a greater effort to meet the people of rural Saskatchewan on rural Saskatchewan turf."

"I felt the University and especially the College of Education, had isolated itself from the community and at times, oblivious to the community in which it was located."

"The current relationships are good but I would like to see them extended."

"On a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being excellent, I would rate the relationship at 3.5 and growing."

"It has only been in recent years ... that we have even had a meaningful relationship with the College of Education. I'm not sure how the current relationship developed, but I suspect there is fault on both sides."

What are the forces that shape these relationships?

Again, communication is the key phrase, this time referring to some professors' inability to speak English fluently as well as the institutional dimension. Many respondents believe that there must be a concerted effort by both University and LEA to make the relationship work. As one superintendent put it:

> The major force which shapes this relationship for the worse is the lack of involvement in the planning phase (of programs). The relationship is viewed with suspicion and mistrust when you are expected to implement a program with very little input into the planning of that program.

Another force which is recognized is related to the perception that is held of individual faculty members. The point was made that the relationship often is not with the College, per se, but with individuals on the faculty who are held in some degree of esteem by the LEA concerned.

One question that was asked indicated that perhaps autonomy was a factor. Can the University be autonomous and at the same time responsive to local needs and requirements?

The remainder of the comments cover much territory but increased personal

dialogue and better communication continue to emerge as major areas of importance if relationships are to be maintained let alone improved. "There must be a defined need" said one respondent, "otherwise the marriage won't work." Another asks if intensified communication attempts are the answer? He replied to his own question by saying, "I really don't know but it surely beats what's in second place!"

Other comments include:

"An important factor in shaping and improving relationships is the provision for consultation. I believe this may have been underemployed by the University as policies and program criteria have been established."

"The University is making a very deliberate and concerted effort to project or extend itself into the community."

"Factors that are most important in shaping relationships are awareness, participation, dialogue and pride." On the subject of pride that same respondent remarked that "an institution of higher learning should be awarded the highest order in a nation. Such is not the case in this country. Here, it's the almighty dollar. Meanwhile, tuition fees are getting so high that only the children of the wealthy or students of rich parents overseas can afford to attend."

"We must meet to discuss the concerns and problems. These meetings are happening but they lack effectiveness. The reason for this ineffectiveness is ... that authority does not accompany responsibility (of the field experience corrdinator) ... "The number of changed staff assignments at the College of Education ... has not helped the situation."

"There are many changes in programs, personnel, courses, etc. that will have an effect on school systems. (While) a person may get a memo or attend a meeting there doesn't appear to be the feeling of openness and communication that a person would like.

In 1974, 1975 and again in 1977, the writer initiated and carried out experimental programs in the supervision of student teachers. As well as organizing the supervisory experiences on a more intensive basis than they had been previously, weekly seminars with students, clinical practices in supervision, teaching university classes to teachers in the regions where supervision was taking place, and generally making oneself as useful as possible to school staffs, were all part of the programs. In other words, there was an attempt to combine the pre-service and inservice roles which a College of Education should play. That the

programs were successful, there is no doubt. Evaluations of these programs were carried out by the University Studies Group attached to the University of Saskatchewan.

It was apparent as the result of the survey and of the supervisory programs, that there are ways in which relationships may be improved as a result of preservice programs. Schools systems must, however, feel part of what is happening at the University.

Inservice Programs

In discussing the long-term effects of the Eight-Year Study, Ralph Tyler wrote that new approaches to curricula and to content often become ends rather than means. He continued:

> Every institution is subject to an ossification that arises when it becomes enamored with its program and finds itself seeking clients to fit the program rather than continually focusing on its clientele and their needs ... We now see that the most significant contribution of the Eight-Year Study was the education it provided in problem-solving, in developing attitudes and skills of educational inquiry. We learned something of great importance to in-service education of teachers: the constructive involvement of teachers in attacking the real educational problems that they face is a powerful instrument of continuing education.

It would seem that this statement has two important implications for those who are engaged in inservice education. The first is that universities must stop thinking in terms of always bringing teachers in to the university to take part in college-based programs. Secondly, teachers must make their needs known and participate in the planning of their own inservice education.

One of the reasons for espousing inservice programs is that they are necessary for one to keep up-to-date. Those who hold to this view (often research workers in education), believe that teachers must constantly be informed "... of what research now says about how to teach reading or how to manage classroom discipline... as if today's answers to these questions are likely to be quite different from yesterday's." (Jackson, 1971). The implication is that educational change is exciting and new discoveries are commonplace. One wonders, however, whether a teacher's skills really would become obsolete if he did not subscribe to a professional journal or stopped going to workshops and never engaged in inservice education. If we presuppose a person who was certificated as a teacher in 1965

but who has not taught and who suddenly decides that he wants to teach, would we hire him over someone who is newly graduated? One may argue that because he has not taught for fifteen years he is out-of-date and should not be hired. But one could also argue that if he has read his newspapers and his magazines, he is probably as familiar with educational trends as his newly graduated counterpart. Keeping up-to-date is not a reason of paramount importance for inservice as far as most teachers are concerned.

According to one writer (Hopkins, 1980), a number of factors have recently combined to argue forcefully for a re-evaluation of our present approach to the inservice or professional development of teachers. These factors include (1) the failure of the curriculum reform movement which has highlighted the primary importance of the teacher in the work place; (2) the period of societal change that we find ourselves in, and (3) recent population trends which have resulted in declining school enrolments with their consequent cutbacks in teaching positions.

This re-evaluation has pointed to serious deficiencies in our inservice provisions, as Fullan has noted (1979):

> There are few things in education which offer so much promise and are so frustratingly wasteful as the multitude of inservice activities and proposals across this country and elsewhere.

The widespread use of 'one-shot' workshops, the lack of follow-up and the abritrary selection of inservice topics are all indicators of a system of professional development which has failed and is failing to enhance the professional skills of our teachers.

Hopkins goes on to discuss the part that the practicum may play in inservice. The clinical supervision model on which most extended practica are based requires input from cooperating teachers. If they are not engaged in a continual process of professional development, then the quality of the product of the interaction is bound to suffer. This is not to imply that there is no professional development amongst cooperating teachers (indeed they are more likely to be professionally autonomous than most), but to highlight a system deficiency which has serious implications for the effective implementation of practicum.

To look at inservice in its proper perspective, the question of what a teacher is must be considered. There is no specific time at which a person is now a teacher having not previously been a teacher. The period of training which a person undergoes in order to be certificated, is arbitrarily set at, say four years. Why not six or ten? Why can't people still be trained to be teachers the way I was -- in thirteen hectic months. In cases of dire

emergencies people have been deemed fit to take charge of a classroom in six weeks. In short, there is no meaningful definition of what a person must know or what he must be able to do, to become a teacher.

"The motive for learning more about teaching," Jackson writes, "is not to repair a personal inadequacy as a teacher but to seek greater fulfillment as a practitioner of art." This statement gives rise to some directions that inservice might take. It suggests that successful teaching stems from the teacher's desire for self-fulfillment. It also suggests that it would be better to focus on helping a teacher accomplish his aims more effectively rather than to focus on the correction of what someone else regards as his weaknesses. Such an approach, focusing as it does on understanding and belief, is deemed superior to that which merely focuses upon the behavioural aspects of teaching (skill components, behavioral objectives, competencies, etc.) and so emphasize the more 'molecular' aspects of the teacher's work. Such views cannot help but affect both the approach and the content of inservice education.

There are other problems inherent in the design of the content of inservice programs. If we subscribe to the belief that the goal of inservice is professional growth then how do we measure where the teacher has "grown" as the result of the inservice? There is no definite time at which a person is or is not a teacher; neither is there such an animal as the 'compleat' teacher although there are some who know more about teaching than others. Probably the single most important source of knowledge about teaching is the act of teaching itself. That, surely, is the only logical reason for paying a person with 6 years of experience more than a person with 3 years. But in order for growth to occur, a teacher must not simply experience experience, he must also benefit from it. Inservice should help the teacher derive some benefit from his experience.

A problem often arises because the content of inservice education may be chosen on the basis of haivng a "gut" feeling that this content is preferable over that content. Suppose that we assume a person who returns to teaching after having had a dozen years in which to deepen and broaden his insights and into teaching. Could we tell the difference between this teacher's ability and one that had not had this kind of opportunity? The interesting but somewhat frustrating fact is that we might not be able to tell the difference. Herein lies one of the more maddening aspects of education -- the absence of visible

"hard" evidence that something is or is not so. School board members may well ask, "How can we afford the luxury of investing in programs that lack tangible evidence of their efficacy?" -- and I think they probably will! In many fields of human endeavor -- education is one -- we must act on the basis of belief rather than of knowledge. We move ahead on the basis of what seems to be most reasonable so that inservice education decisions must be made on that basis. The question asked is what schools and teachers might be, rather than what they are, always bearing in mind that the difference between training and education is that the former reduces the individual's range of alternatives and the latter increases it.

It is questionable whether the typical teacher is anxious to increase his teaching competency through attendance at inservice sessions. That attitude may be a function of the fact that inservice is frequently seen as being irrelevant. One is therefore faced with a problem of how to ensure that teachers see inservice as being of value to them. Factors which mitigate against this happening include:

1. Most teachers will have experienced many attempts to influence them to change.
2. Many of these experiences have not seemed relevant to any felt need of the teachers and have resulted in the development of defensive attitudes.
3. Many teachers who have attempted changes as a result of participation in inservice programs, have experienced frustration and lack of support.
4. Frequently the stimulus to participate in inservice programs comes from authority or an inept invitation to volunteer with no prior opportunity of sampling.

Recently the writer was involved in an inservice program with the entire teaching population of a rural school division. The number of teachers, principals, and central office personnel involved was 185. The program was requested by the Director of Education for the school division and the College of Education agreed to attempt the program. Because the program was unique in its scope and magnitude, the College was at risk. The program was an attempt to introduce clinical supervisory concepts to the teaching staff. It was offered over a period of three months from August 30 to December 8, 1979, and it was of twenty hours duration.

The results of the program were mixed. From the start it was obvious that some of the teachers were strongly influenced by the factors mitigating against teachers seeing the inservice as being of value. The evaluations showed that there was a percentage of teachers working through the program who displayed a marked lack of enthusiasm. More effort to effect a change in attitude may have been desirable. A problem also existed because the division wished the program to include content such that if the participants put in a certain amount of extra time, they could obtain university credit for a graduate class in supervision. To a large extent then the tail wagged the dog. By no means did all of the teachers seek a class credit (about one-seventh) and evaluations showed that a number of other teachers resented the inservice being mixed in with content for credit.

All studies seem to point to the involvement of teachers and initiative by teachers as being necessary for the success of inservice programs. This involvement implies that they ought to be involved in the identification and articulation of their needs. Such was not done in this case as over one-half of the teachers saw this program as being inapplicable to their needs. As against that however, well over one-half said, at the program's end, that they could make use of clinical supervision and that they would take steps to implement it.

Wherever possible teachers should have an opportunity to sample the contents of the inservice program before they are required to display any commitment to it. In two of the thirteen schools some preparatory work had been carried out. In five other schools the writer had had the opportunity to meet with each staff and to discuss the program with them. He also attended several principal's meetings. At these discussions it became evident that summative and formative evaluation procedures were going to cause problems. It also became evident that some teachers were deeply suspicious of the motives of those who were seen as forcing through a program of clinical supervision in the school division. Some of the comments in this regard were:

"should affect only those concerned."

"make it voluntary and more practical."

"don't force us to take inservice."

"don't call us, we'll call you."

"more grass roots involvement -- don't force it on us."

"convince participants of necessity."

"had to spend too much time selling program -- too many teachers with negative attitudes."

At the same time, the evaluations showed that, where the writer was able to work with individual staffs and teachers, the ratings were very much higher than they were for the program as a whole.

It was apparent very early that the success of the program was in the balance. While one should rarely proceed on the basis of assumption alone, one does. The writer assumed that the teachers were able to reach a measure of agreement, a measure it was hoped would be considerable, regarding their expectations, standards of behavior and golas during the course of staff discussions held at the end of the first day of the program. It became apparent that my assumption was ill-founded and confusion and mistrust abounded. Steps had to be taken quickly to try to alleviate the confusion and mistrust. These steps were only partially successful.

The relevance and feasibility of a particular learning program should be communicated as often as possible either through accepted peers or through other "accepted persons" so that the natural defences of caution and distrust can be mitigated. Many teachers are ambivalent in this writer's case. Sixteen years of teaching in public school systems have made him an "accepted person" in many teachers' opinion; a position as a professor in a College of Education has made him suspect in the opinion of others. Professors of Education are often seen as having axes to grind and questions were asked about the University's and the writer's ability, interest and willingness, as well as a commitment, to follow through with an adequate delivery system and to be available as and when required. The two immediate questions were, "Whose thesis were we writing?" and "Are we doing this for your book so that you can get promotion?" No further comment is required.

One very positive aspect of the program lay in teachers working with peers to develop supervisory skills rather than having to work with someone who had been formally designated as supervisor. One of the most powerful advantages of team teaching has been the opportunity for members of the team to learn from one another. That opportunity was given to those who wished to avail themselves of it and teachers were encouraged to work in supervision teams. There are those who doubt the efficacy of such an arrangement on the grounds that teachers do not respond to peers as well as they do to trained experts. Such an attitude rests on two assumptions neither of which are wholly correct. The first is that teachers are not experts; the second is that all experts have something that they are able to communicate to non-experts. Much more acceptable is the premise that teachers working together is akin to experts working together to advance their own expertness so that the university role may become one of facilitator and consultant.

CONCLUSION

There is no doubt that relationships between Universities and LEA's are not all that they should be. It is noted that a number of universities have proposed linking and integrating a number of University units to form a Division of Extension and Community Relations. Reationalization has its benefits, but it is no panacea. Without adequate staff, without institutional commitment to the extension function, without the recognition that this function is as important as any other which the University carries out, any internal reorganization will have essentially no impact.

It is also apparent that the greatest relationship is that which exists between the University College of Education and LEA's. Success in this relationship is that which is encompassed by openness and communication. It entails more dialogue on a personal basis and meetings which need people present who have authority which accompanies responsibility. There is a felt need among LEA's to participate in the planning of various programs of student teaching and to be made aware of what happens to prospective teachers as they complete their coursework. At the same time it does appear that for most who are involved in the preservice aspect of the relationship, that relationship has improved and is improving. The new thrust of the Extension Division at this university and increased contact with LEA's through better supervisory practices will, it is hoped, lead to improved relations.

As one result of inservice feedback the following recommendations emerge:

1. There must be involvement of teachers in planning inservice programs.
2. There must be sufficient lead time in acquainting and familiarizing teachers with the program to be attempted. Working with school staffs beforehand will eliminate much of the ambivalence with which many teachers approach inservice.
3. Sufficient commitment from the University to make available personnel and other resources is vital.
4. Teachers must see any inservice program as contributing to the improvement of their teaching effectiveness. The University must not be seen as carrying out the program simply to enhance its own image or objectives.
5. Some consideration must be given to voluntary participation so that volunteers could then become instructors in their own schools. In conjunction with this, no class credit should be given unless all participants may obtain it.
6. As in the preservice component, openness and communication must be present.

Inservice and staff development go hand-in-hand. We assume that in education as in everything else, there is need for change and for renewal. Staff development is based on this assumption and bears the major responsibility for continuity in program quality, for responsiveness to educational needs and initiative for change. Any school district committed to a program of quality in education must also be committed to programs of inservice education and staff renewal. So must Colleges of Education.

Finally, there are several encouraging trends which must be mentioned. First is the apparent willingness of Colleges of Education to devote personnel and other resources to field-based operations. Second is the advent of teacher centres where putting teachers in control of at least part of their inservice education is going to change attitudes for the better. Making inservice education a legitimate part of a teacher's work may be a significant move in this regard. Third and most important is a growing belief that preservice and inservice could become a continuum of teacher education. By so doing, teacher education could become "a conscious and deliberate program to prepare people for the roles they will need to assume." (Edelfelt, 1979)

References

Bishop, Leslie J. Staff Development and Instructional Improvement. Boston: Allyn Bacon Inc., 1976.

Bush, Robert N. "Curriculum-Proof Teachers", in Louis J. Rubin (ed.). Improving In-Service Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1971.

Edelfelt, Roy A. "Inservice Teacher Education: A Concept, An Overview", Inservice. Syracuse: National Council of States on Inservice Education, April, 1979.

Fischer, Louis. "Inservice Education: An Immodest Proposal", in Louis J. Rubin (ed.). Improving In-service Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1971.

Fullan, Michael, School Focused In-service in Canada. OECD, 1979.

Guba, Egon. "Educational Decision-Making", a paper presented to the Conference on Strategies for Educational Change, Washington, D.C., 1965.

Harris, Ben M. and Bessent, W. Inservice Education: A Guide to Better Practice. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Havelock, Ronald G. Planning for Innovation, Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge of the Institute for Social Research, 1969.

_____. The Change Agent's Guide to Innovation in Education, Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications, 1973.

Hopkins, David. "The Role of the Practicum in Bridging the Gap Between School and University", a paper presented to the Western Canada Student Teaching Association Conference, Edmonton, Alberta, March, 1980.

Jackson, Philip W. "Old Dogs and New Tricks", in Louis J. Rubin (ed.). Improving In-Service Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1971.

Lawrence, Gordon. Patterns of Effective In-Service Education, a report prepared for the State of Florida, Department of Education, 1974.

Lippitt, Ronald and Fox, Robert. "Development and Maintainance of Effective Classroom Learning", in Louis J. Rubin (ed.). Improving In-Service Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1971.

Miles, Mathew B. Change Processes in the Public School. Eugene, CASEA, University of Oregon, 1965.

Pinder, H.C. (chairman). "Report of the Committee to Examine External Relations of the University." Saskatoon: University of Saskatchewan, 1977.

Sucher, Floyd. "Staff Development for Reading Teacher." Journal of Research and Development in Education. Athens: 11:3:44-53, 1978.

Wolf, W.C. "Some Perspectives in Communication," Journal of Research and Development in Education. Athens: 6:4:4-13, 1973.